

REMARKS

The Office Action Summary says that the drawings filed on January 6, 2010 are objected to by the Examiner but there is nothing in the Detailed Action about why they are objected to. The undersigned telephoned the Examiner to ask about this objection. The Examiner said it was a typographical error that will be corrected.

The Rejection of the Claims

A. The Rejection of Claims 8-11 Under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph As Indefinite.

In support of this rejection the Examiner says "[A]pplicant should clarify the structure of "an interior portion of the bushing is disposed inside the enclosure" recited in Claim 8. The interior of the bushing would enclose the vacuum switching chamber, as shown in figures 2, therefore for the purpose of examination the Examiner considers **lower portion** of the bushing located below plate 5 as the interior portion. (emphasis in original)"

Applicant does not, for the reasons given below, agree with the Examiner's statement that the interior of the bushing shown in Fig. 2 would enclose the vacuum switching chamber.

As is stated in paragraph 0033 of the Patent Application Publication No. 2007/0145015 for this application, the seal 6 provides the seal to the gas area. Thus in Fig. 2 that which is below edge board 5 and seal 6 must be the gas filled enclosure. Therefore the interior portion of the bushing recited in claim 8 that "is disposed inside the enclosure" is that part of the bushing shown in Fig. 2 that is below edge board 5 and the exterior portion of the bushing recited in claim 8 that is disposed outside the enclosure" is that part of the bushing shown in Fig. 2 that is above edge board 5. Applicant requests reconsideration of this rejection.

B. The Rejection of Claims 8-11 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner bases this rejection on Nonken (US 3,812,314) in view of Renz et al. (US 6,720,515). These same two references

10/583,216

were used by the Examiner in the Final Office Action ("FOA") dated February 7, 2011 to reject claims 8-11 as obvious. In response thereto, applicant filed a Notice of Appeal and thereafter an Appeal Brief that discusses these two references and that discussion is incorporated herein by reference.

These same two references were also used in Office Actions prior to the February 7, 2011 FOA and Applicant hereby incorporates by reference all of the discussions of Nonken and Renz et al. in the replies to those Office Actions.

Applicant submits that based on those discussions that claims 8-11 are not obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art based on Nonken in view of Renz et al. and request reconsideration of this rejection and this application.

Applicant is also of even date herewith filing the attached Notice of Appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 8, 2012

/Michael M. Rickin/
Michael M. Rickin
Reg. No. 26,984
Attorney for Applicant
ABB Inc.
29801 Euclid Avenue
Wickliffe, OH 44092
(440) 585-7840